

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ENITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/718,554	11/24/2003	Tetsuya Satou	OGOH:089A	1824
6160	7590 01/12/2005		EXAMINER	
PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P. 1421 PRINCE STREET			YAMNITZKY, MARIE ROSE	
SUITE 210	LITALET		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314-2805		1774		

DATE MAILED: 01/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	10/718,554	SATOU ET AL.				
nancery near.	Examin r	Art Unit				
	Marie R. Yamnitzky	1774				
Th MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 07 December 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.						
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
b)						
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:						
(a) ☑ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.						
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>						
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.						
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed: 22-42 and 48-50.						
Claim(s) objected to: 45-47.						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>19-21,43,44 and 51-53</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None.						
8.☐ The drawing correction filed on is a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.						
9.⊠ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). rec'd 16 Sept 2004.						
10. ☐ Other:						
		•				
· .						

Continuation of 2. NOTE:

Proposed amendment provides claims that are of a different scope than any of the finally rejected claims, thereby requiring further consideration at least under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103.

Proposed amendment regarding the number of carbon atoms in the phenylene group also requires further consideration; it is not clear if this language excludes substituted phenylene groups in which the substituent comprises at least one carbon atom.

Entry of proposed amended claim 43 would also result in claim 44 being an improper dependent claim because the compound named in claim 44 is a compound of general formula (13) in which each of X1 and X2 represents a hydrogen atom.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Arguments regarding the limitations of the proposed amended claims are not persuasive because the amendment will not be enter d for reasons noted above. Therefore, the issues remain as set forth in the final rejection.

The arguments regarding the rejection of claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. 102 based on the Kawamura patent are also not persuasive because Kawamura does show an unsubstituted phenylene group between two nitrogens, which meets the limitations of Ar3. Arguments regarding superior properties are not supported by objective evidence.

MARIE YAMNITZKY PRIMARY EXAMINER

Marie K. Januntzky